

Action Item

*Educational Policy and Programs Committee*

Approval of the Minutes of the February 4-5, 2001, Meeting

---

---

# MINUTES

## *Educational Policy and Programs Committee*

### Meeting of February 4-5, 2001

---

**Committee members present** Ralph Pesqueira, *Chair*  
Velma Montoya  
Evonne Schulze  
Kyhle Smeby  
Alan S. Arkatov, *ex officio*  
Carol Chandler, *ex officio*

**Commissioner arriving after the roll call** Kyo “Paul” Jhin, *Vice Chair*

**Committee member absent** Howard Welinsky

**Other Commissioners present**  
Phillip J. Forhan  
Robert Hanff  
Lance Izumi  
Guillermo Rodriguez  
Melinda Wilson

---

**Call to order** Chair Pesqueira called the meeting of the California Postsecondary Education Commission Education Policy and Programs Committee to order at 3:53 p.m. on February 4, 2001 in the University of Southern California, Davidson Executive Conference Center, Embassy Room, 3415 South Figueroa Street, Los Angeles, California.

---

**Eligibility study of the 2001 class of public high school graduates for admission to the State’s public universities**

Chair Pesqueira called upon Commission staff member Stacy Wilson to provide a prospectus on the 2001 Eligibility Study.

Mr. Wilson reported that the Commission has been doing higher education eligibility studies of state high school graduates since 1960. He said the results are comprehensive analyses of the academic preparation of California high school graduates in relationship to the admission criteria of the State University and the University of California. He said the latest study would be the first in a new era of accountability in public schools.

Mr. Wilson reviewed the history of changing eligibility criteria at the State’s public universities. He said the last Commission eligibility study done in 1996 found that the number of California students from public high schools eligible to attend a public university was slightly less than target percentages set by the 1960 Master Plan. He said the new study would help assess the effectiveness of new initiatives to boost eligibility levels.

There was a discussion about the differences between eligibility and enrollment or participation rates. Participation rates are always lower than eligibility rates because some students who are eligible do not enroll at a CSU or UC campus or they enroll elsewhere. Commissioner Pesqueira said one undesirable result of such a study – one

documenting a disparity between the Master Plan numbers, actual eligibility, and participation rates — could be an adjustment of admission standards that might lower the admission standards. He said Legislators and others would need to understand the difference between eligibility and participation rates is often the result of student decisions.

Mr. Wilson explained some the methodology being used in the study. He said a state-wide task force is being assembled to aid Commission staff with the 2001 study. He said the sampling would start at all public high schools, including charter schools, this summer. He said the response rate in the past has been some 95 percent.

Commission staff member Adrian Griffin discussed some of the changed data-classification standards that will affect the new eligibility study. He said resources allow for more analysis of eligibility against a wider array of other factors such as courses offered. Commissioner Chandler said it is important to see what relationship there is between eligibility and access to required courses.

Mr. Wilson discussed the prospect for some follow-up studies once the main eligibility study is completed. There was a discussion about the evolution of the University of California's eligibility criteria, included the required standardized tests.

In response to a question from Commissioner Jhin, Mr. Wilson said eligibility data about some home-schooled students would be captured by the inclusion of charter school data in the samples collected.

---

**Methodology of  
the Commission's  
regional higher  
education  
enrollment  
demand study**

Chair Pesqueira called upon Mr. Wilson to present this item.

Mr. Wilson reported that the Commission's current study of higher education enrollment demand is being estimated on a regional basis. He explained the methodology for this work by staff. He gave some examples of recent changes in enrollment demand and discussed the enrollment patterns of those students taking into account segmental, geographic, and demographic factors.

Mr. Wilson said the study would look at capacity in relationship to enrollment demand. He cited the example of work done by consultant Bill Storey to examine community college capacity by region. Mr. Wilson said the issue that quickly emerges is that much of the additional community college capacity statewide is not well matched on a regional basis with increased demand. Mr. Storey commented that there is a mismatch between facilities and enrollment demand. It is an ongoing problem. He said there would be a permanent need for the additional capital outlay and for a rational system to distribute those funds.

Committee Chair Pesqueira and other commissioners agreed that these data provides the Commission with valuable information to use in the legislative arena. There was a discussion of how to present these data during capital outlay discussions.

Commissioner Forhan said these data open the door to discussions about the split of revenues that might go to the respective systems from a new education bond measure. Commissioner Schulze said information from the completed report would be valuable to

those supporting education bonds at the local level. She asked when it would be completed. Mr. Wilson said staff would complete the study in June 2001.

Commission Chair Arkatov asked about assessing the impact of distance learning on meeting growing enrollment demand. Mr. Storey said defining the term distance learning was important, but that community colleges have long used off-campus education centers to meet some of the existing enrollment demand. Commission staff member Dave Leveille said the Commission is creating a distance learning survey for all of higher education.

---

**Recess** Committee Chair Pesqueira recessed the meeting at 4:54 p.m.

---

**Reconvene** Chair Pesqueira reconvened the meeting on Monday, February 5 at 11:45 a.m.

---

**Approval of the minutes** Chair Pesqueira asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the committee's October 16 and December 11, 2000 meetings. A motion was made to adopt the minutes for both meetings, it was seconded and passed without dissent.

---

**Needs analysis for  
College of the  
Sequoias Center  
for Agriculture  
Science and  
Technology – a  
new homestead**

Chair Pesqueira called upon staff member Beth Graybill to present this item.

Ms. Graybill reviewed a proposal by the by the Sequoia Community College District to build an Agriculture Science and Technology center in the southern portion of Tulare County. The proposed center would enable the college to relocate its current farm laboratory from the city of Visalia to a 493-acre site just outside the city of Tulare.

Ms. Graybill said the center would serve students from both Tulare and Kings counties that have a very large Hispanic/Latino community. Unemployment in the area is high, income levels low, and population growth is expected to be over 40 percent by the middle of the next decade. Regionally, university attendance rates are low. This is particularly true in the outlying rural areas where university preparation courses are not readily available.

Ms. Graybill said the center is expected to open in 2005 with some 1,100 full-time students. She said the proposal reflects the area's emphasis on agricultural business such as dairy production. The center will be responsive to the academic needs of the local community by offering a wide breath of lower-division and transfer-related course work, and expand the overall enrollment capacity of the district. It also provides additional enrollment capacity in the area at a time when it will be needed.

Ms. Graybill reviewed the site layout and said the district has provided an estimated cost of \$30 million. She said because two local bonds have failed, there might be greater reliance on State capital outlay funds for construction. As a result, the center's opening date could be pushed back. Commissioner Schulze noted that such bond measures no longer has to meet the old two-thirds majority requirement.

Ms. Graybill said the proposed center has been developing accordance with statewide needs, has strong local regional governmental and educational support, and has many

outreach programs for K-12 students. Staff recommended that the district address the needs of limited English-speaking students, and that the planning reflect regional collaboration with other districts. She said staff recommended that the Center for Agriculture Science and Technology become an official state-approved educational center.

Commissioner Chandler said the center reflects the many exciting developments in the Tulare area for agriculture-related business. She asked about partnerships between the Sequoias district and the State universities. Dr. Badrkhan, Sequoias President, said the center has partnership programs with U.C. Davis and the California State University, Fresno.

Commissioner Forhan urged the Commission to approve the facility. He said it represented a very positive opportunity for students in that region. Chair Arkatov noted that the project included programs for local high school students on the community college campus.

---

**Recess**     Committee Chair Pesqueira recessed the meeting at 12:08 p.m.

---

**Reconvene**     Committee Chair Pesqueira reconvened the meeting at 1:24 p.m.

---

**Report on part-time faculty compensation in California Community Colleges**

Chair Pesqueira said persons who had asked to speak on this report would be heard after the staff presentation.

He called on Commission staff member Kathleen Chavira to present this information item.

Ms. Chavira introduced several members of the advisory committee assembled for the study. She reported that the provisions of Assembly Bill 420 had directed the Commission to conduct a study on part-time faculty employment, salary, and compensation patterns in the California Community Colleges. She said MGT, Inc. had been retained to assist staff with a study. Ms. Chavira reviewed the history and methodology of the study noting:

- ◆ The scope and focus of the study was guided by the mandating legislation.
- ◆ Faculty at 22 target community college districts was surveyed. The overall survey response rate was 22 percent. Survey data were compared to other data sources for validation. Other data sources included local, State, and national data information, as well as a literature survey.

Ms. Chavira also reviewed some of the key findings of the study. Among them were:

- ◆ Part-time community college instructors earn, on average, 50 to 60 percent less than full-time faculty.
- ◆ Districts in urban areas have higher salaries and reflect less disparity between the salaries of full- and part-time faculty. Geographic location was the single factor which explained salary-level differences.

- ♦ Community college districts in other states reflected similar differences between the salary for full- and part-time faculty.
- ♦ Forty-one percent of the part-time faculty receive no employee benefits from their districts.
- ♦ Generally, part-time faculty is not compensated for keeping office hours.
- ♦ Twenty-five percent of the part-time and 10 percent of full-time faculty receive retirement income from another source.
- ♦ For part-time faculty, additional full-time employment was reported by 27 percent, 75 percent had other employment (less than full time), and 16 to 18 percent teach at multiple districts.
- ♦ Six percent of the part-time instructors teach nine or more units at multiple districts.
- ♦ About half of the part-time instructors reported interest in full-time employment.
- ♦ Full-time instructors reported spending 81 percent of their time on instruction-related activities. This finding was consistent with national data, but differs from a figure of 88 percent in a study done on community college faculty by the Bureau of State Audits.

Ms. Chavira said the issue of a statewide compensation policy for part-time faculty at community colleges is complicated by a governance system that emphasizes local decision making. She said any compensation policy should balance market forces with the need to provide all students with a consistent educational experience. Part-time faculty has provided the flexibility of the community colleges to meet its mandated mission and any policy must allow for continued flexibility to meet changes local needs.

There are differences among part-time faculty and addressing the needs of one sub-set does not necessarily address overall concerns regarding part-time faculty compensation. She cited a number of factors to be considered in developing a statewide policy including accountability, related infrastructure costs, and the preservation of those aspects of part-time faculty which make them a valuable asset to the community colleges. She clarified that AB 420 requires recommendations which would enable the California Community Colleges to achieve a compensation schedule that provides pay equity for part-time faculty. The Commission recommendations provide some alternatives, although state policy makers will need to decide the appropriate role of the State in this matter. Among the ideas for consideration are:

- ♦ Statewide policy should be articulated as to the minimum core functions of faculty at community colleges.
- ♦ Local community college districts be encouraged to develop salary schedules for part-time faculty, which have structures more comparable to that of full-time instructors.
- ♦ Districts with the least difference between compensation levels should be examined for ideas and successful strategies that are applicable to others.

- ♦ Local districts should look at their current distribution of compensation resources, for example, the uneven distribution of cost-of-living increases.
- ♦ Community college districts explore how benefits as a component of compensation can be provided to part-time faculty.
- ♦ Ongoing data-gathering and analysis to ensure informed policy and decision making.

Ms. Chavira summarized by re-emphasizing that:

- ♦ There is a significant difference between full- and part-time faculty compensation that is not related to experience and qualifications.
- ♦ The needs of part-time faculty are varied.
- ♦ Responding to these varied needs is a complex undertaking.

Commissioner Schulze said the report clarifies many questions about an ongoing community college issue. She said local governance is a critical factor. The problem may not be solvable, but there may be alternatives to consider.

Commission Forhan reported that the community colleges goal is for a ratio of 75/25 of full-to- part-time faculty in terms of teaching load. He said districts receive financial incentives to make progress toward that goal. The current average is about 60/40. He said the Commission's report answers many questions about a complex topic. He noted that the Governor had proposed some \$62 million more to address the salary equity issue, but there are other matters of collective bargaining and shared governance at the local level to be addressed as well. He commented that the study does not address the issue of overload instruction.

Committee Chair Pesqueira questioned what input beyond data gathering the Commission can provide about an issue that is essentially a function of community college's collective bargaining and shared governance process.

Commissioner Forhan acknowledged the unique nature of the community college governance process, but said the Board of Governors had made the pay-equity issue a priority. However, it is a complex issue because, on the one hand, there is the belief that part-time faculty is underpaid while, on the other hand, part-time faculty provides the community colleges with flexibility needed to meet student needs. He said there are many factors that must operate concurrently to address the issue.

In response to a question from Commissioner Rodriguez, Ms. Chavira noted one significant difference between the reports of the Commission and the Bureau of State Audits for part-time faculty. She said that the Commission had reported that \$245 million would be needed to close the salary gap. The Bureau report cited \$144 million.

Committee Chair Pesqueira called upon a number of speakers. Among the highlights of those comments are the following:

- ♦ Judith Michaels, from the California Federation of Teachers, said the data in the study is valuable but that the policy options need development and the federation will

participate in that process. She said part-time faculty is an institutionalized part of the community college system. She said part-time instructors teach many core classes.

- ♦ Robert Yoshioka -- a part-time instructor and representative of part-time faculty from the Southern California Representative of Faculty Association of California Community Colleges -- stated that the Commission study had some methodological problems. He said the system would experience gridlock without part-time faculty. He cited a number of ways in which part-time faculty are treated differentially from full-time instructors. He said that factors beyond market forces are responsible for underpaying part-time faculty. He said that most part-time faculty stay 7.5 years while it takes over 12 to become vested in the retirement system.
- ♦ Lantz Simpson -- representing California Part-time Faculty Association, President of the Santa Monica Community College Faculty Association -- said the association supports having comparable salary/benefit schedule, and that student advising by part-time faculty is overlooked in the Commission report. He cited a number of factors about the pro-rata pay scale for instructors at Santa Monica College. He said CPFA supports the 88 percent factor cited in the Bureau of Audits report. Students and colleges should have the right to full-service instructors whether the faculty is full- or part-time.
- ♦ David Hawkins, Governmental Affairs Director of the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges, said the issue of part-time faculty has been not been addressed. He said job security is an important issue to many part-time faculty members. The Commission might benefit from a general informational hearing about the Community College system. He recommended reading the Bureau of State Audits report, citing the Bureau's findings that, between 1994 and 1999, the total instructional workload at the community colleges had increased by the equivalent of more than 3,000 full-time positions. He said part-time instructors had absorbed some 75 percent of that increase. He asked for additional recommendations that call for budget augmentations for any core faculty functions that might be identified, and that there be a study of how the overuse of part-time faculty affects educational quality. He said the teaching-related workload calculation of 88 percent in the Bureau report is accounted for by inclusion of advising and counseling.
- ♦ Ms. Field -- a member of the Los Angeles Community College Board of Trustees, faculty member at Glendale Community College, and current Vice President of the California Federation of Teachers, Community College Council -- cited the Governor's \$62-million allocation to upgrade part-time faculty pay as a trend she hoped would continue in the future. She said state-provided resources are necessary.

Commission Chair Arkatov said it is the Commission's intent to meet in April at a University of California campus and in July at a community college. Mr. Hawkins recommended the Foothill/DeAnza District or several campuses in San Francisco Bay Area.



Chair Arkatov asked if it is known what percentage of the Tidal Wave II students would be taught by part-time instructors. Committee Chair Pesqueira said that is an assignment for staff.

---

**Update on the  
Commission's  
Student  
Information and  
Accountability  
System**

Committee Chair Pesqueira called upon Martin Miller to present this item.

Mr. Miller reviewed the provisions of AB 1570 that mandated the augmentation of the Commission's student information system with a unique student identifier for each record. He reviewed a number of steps taken so far to implement the new system. He said the addition of a unique student identifier to student records would make it possible to do longitudinal studies of academic progress and success. He said the community colleges and State University have agreed to supply the identifiers starting with 1994 records, and UC submissions will begin with 1999 records. It is planned that one of the first studies will be on student transfer.

Mr. Miller said the new system would have strong security measures to protect student data. He said a number of personnel have been hired for this undertaking. He said an advisory committee meeting is set for the end of February.

Director Fox reiterated that extraordinary steps are being taken to protect student data and records.

Commissioner Rodriguez said he was looking forward to new information that will be forthcoming. Commissioner Forhan asked when the system would be operational. Mr. Leveille said that studies could commence once the segments have given the Commission the student-identifier data as requested.

---

**Adjournment**

Having no further business, Chair Pesqueira adjourned the committee meeting at 3:04 p.m.

---

---

